UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,324	02/28/2002	Ephraim Webster Dobbins	050115-1110	8520

24504 7590 07/07/2006

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER	
MURPHY, RHONDA L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/085,324	DOBBINS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rhonda Murphy	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,10-13 and 18-21* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6-9,14-17,22 and 23* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/6/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informality: Claim 9 is improperly dependent upon itself and should be dependent upon claim 8. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-5, 10-13 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig et al. (US 7,031,314).

Regarding claims 1 and 18, Craig teaches a method of determining a source of an Internet protocol (IP) packet, comprising the steps of: comparing a destination address

of said IP packet to a first destination address stored within a first destination address cell of a memory, and comparing a destination port of said IP packet to a first destination port stored within a first destination port cell of said memory (Figs 2 & 3A; col. 11, lines 24-32); comparing a source address of said IP packet to a first source address stored within a first source address cell of said memory, and comparing a source port of said IP packet to a first source port stored within a first source port cell of said memory, wherein said stored first source address and said stored first source port are associated with said stored first destination address and said stored first destination port (col. 11, lines 24-32); and storing said source address and said source port of said IP packet within said memory (col. 11, lines 57-63) to determine said source of said IP packet if: said address and port of said IP packet match said stored first address and said stored first port; and said address and said port of said IP packet do not match said stored first address and stored first port (col. 20, lines 56-67); and said stored first source address and said stored first source port are universal bits, wherein universal bits are bits that except any value (col. 20, lines 8-20).

Craig fails to explicitly disclose said destination address and port of said IP packet matching said stored first destination address port; and said source address and port of said IP packet not matching said stored first source address and port.

However, since Craig discloses packet header fields matching and not matching, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to conclude the destination address and port, and source address and port are included in such matching and non-matching

steps, for the purpose of determining whether or not such packet header fields (source and destination information) already exist in the table.

Regarding claims 2, 11 and 19, Craig teaches modifying and replacing headers of an IP packet (col. 12, lines 52-67). Craig fails to explicitly disclose the steps of: removing a first header from said IP packet, wherein said first header comprises said source address of said IP packet and said destination address of said IP packet; and removing a second header from said IP packet, wherein said second header comprises said source port of said IP packet and said destination port of said IP packet.

However, Examiner takes official notice that removing first and second headers, wherein the headers include source and destination addresses and ports, is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to remove the headers, in order to process the payload.

Regarding claims 3, 12 and 20, Craig teaches the step of replacing said source address, said destination address, said source port, and said destination port of said IP packet with translation addresses if said source address, said destination address, said source port, and said destination port of said IP packet are the same as said stored first source address, said stored first destination address, said stored first source port, and said stored first destination port (col. 19, lines 65-67; col. 20, lines 1-2, 8-29).

Regarding claims 4, 13 and 21, Craig teaches the step of replacing said source address, said destination address, said source port, and said destination port of said IP packet with translation addresses if said destination address and said destination port of said IP packet are the same as said stored first destination address and said stored first

destination port, and said stored first source address and said stored first source port are universal bits (col. 19, lines 65-67; col. 20, lines 1-2, 8-29).

Regarding claim 5, Craig teaches said memory is a content addressable memory (Fig 2; memory 240).

Regarding claim 10, Craig teaches a memory (Fig. 2; memory 240); and a processor (Fig. 3A; 325) performing the steps described above in the rejection of claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 6-9, 14-17, 22 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US Patent 7,013,333 to Skells and US Publication 2003/0123421 to Feige et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rhonda Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-3185. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rhonda Murphy
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

RM

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600